H

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/324,568	06/02/1999	ADRIAN O. MANCINI	0500.01327	1726

7590   07/15/2003

CHRISTOPHER J. RECKAMP
MARKISON & RECKAMP, P.C.
P.O. BOX 06229
WACKER DRIVE
CHICAGO, IL 606060229

EXAMINER
ZAND, KAMBIZ

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2132	

DATE MAILED: 07/15/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 07-01)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/324,568	MANCINI ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Kambiz Zand	2132	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *27 June 2003* .

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *1-21* is/are pending in the application.

     4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) *1-10 and 12-21* is/are rejected.

7) ☒ Claim(s) *11* is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) ☒ The proposed drawing correction filed on *27 June 2003* is: a) ☒ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

     If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

     a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

       1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

       2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

       3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

     * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

     a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .	6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

1. The text of those sections of Title 35,U.S.Code not included in this section can be found in the prior office action.

2. The prior office actions are incorporated herein by reference. In particular, the observations with respect to claim language, and response to previously presented arguments.

3. Claims 1, 5, 9 and 15 have been amended.

4. Claims 1-21 are pending.

5. Examiner withdraws objection to the drawings and specification due to correction by the applicant.

6. Examiner withdraws rejection of claims 5-6,8,13-14,17-19 and 20 under 35 U.S.C 112-second paragraphs due to correction by the applicant.

7. Examiner withdraws objections of claims 1-21 due to corrections and clarification by Applicant.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments filed 06/27/03 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

As per claims 1-4,9-10 and 15-18 Applicant agrees Abadi teach "the cross certification occurs among different authorities" (see page 11 paragraph 3 of the response) but asserts that Abadi only disclose "the starting authority among inter subordinate authority is constant" in contrast with Applicant's invention wherein inter

trust authority modification data "**to change the starting authority amongst subordinate authority**".

Examiner refers Applicant to col.7, lines 27-40 wherein the main authority called group manager adds a principal (inter subordinate authority) to the group and changes the starting authority amongst other subordinate or other principal by allowing the principal to allow access request or certification request directly (see col.7, lines 38-40). Therefore there is generation of inter trust authority modification data to change the starting authority.

Col.7, lines 41-68 and col.8, lines 1-2 disclose how cross certification between multiple certification authority takes place all the way up to a common ancestor (superior authority).

As per claims 5 and 19 in light of limitations of claim 1 and 15 Abedi disclose the certification considered as data is being signed data in col.8, lines 37-44. the changing of the starting authority was disclosed above.

However Examiner agrees with Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 11 in light of limitations of claim 10 and 9 wherein the signing becomes more specific.

As per claims 6,, 12 and 20 Abedi teach at least one of the limitations of the claim "certificate expiry policy" in col.8, lines 47-52.

As per claims 7 and 13 Abedi disclose in col.8, lines 1-2 that trust authority is a root

authority (common ancestor).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

9. **Claims 1-10 and 12-21** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated

by Abadi et al (5,315,657 A).

As per claims 1 and 15 Abadi et al (5,315,657 A) teach an information security

system and method comprising: a plurality of trusted authorities configurable in a

rooted hierarchical structure (see col.7, lines 40-47) including at least one of the

trusted authorities being a superior authority (see col.7, lines 27-29) and at least one

of the trusted authorities being a subordinate authorities (see col.7, lines 45-48); and

the superior authority operative to generate an inter trust authority modification data

to a dynamically vary validation starting authorities among the subordinate

authorities (see 66-68 and col.8, lines 1-2 wherein an inter trust between the

different certificate authorities is being implemented by cross-certifying each other

wherein their root is a common ancestor). Also see col.6, lines 58-68; col.7, lines 1-

28; col.8, lines 55-68 and col.9 for more detailed inter trust between different

authorities, their certification and verification.

As per claims 2 and 16 Abadi et al (5,315,657 A) teach the system and method of claims 1 and 15 wherein at least one of the subordinate authorities includes a certificate issuer operatively responsive to the inter trusted authority modification data for issuing certificate for at least one subscriber based on the inter trusted authority modification data (see col.7, lines 48-65 and col.col.8, lines 12-44 wherein the request for certification that is the modified data is being certified by inter trust authorities by issuing a signed certificate).

As per claims 3 and 17 Abadi et al (5,315,657 A) teach the system and method of claims 1 and 15 wherein at least one of the subordinate authorities includes a subscriber trust anchor specifier, operatively responsive to the inter trusted authority modification data, that generates trust modification data for a plurality of subscribers (see col.9, lines 24-54).

Claim 9 is combination of claims 1-3 and therefore Abadi et al (5,315,657 A) teach all limitation of the claim as being rejected based on rejection of claims 1-3 above.

As per claims 4, 10 and 18 Abadi et al (5,315,657 A) teach the system and method of claims 3, 9 and 17 wherein the trust anchor modification data includes subordinate trust anchor data representing at least one trust anchor different from a local trust authority (see col.66-68 and col.8, lines 1-2 wherein one of the user is not

certified by a local trust authority and that's why cross certification is being done

between them in order to create a trust).

As per claims 5 and 19 Abadi et al (5,315,657 A) teach the system and method of

claims 1 and 15 wherein the superior authority includes a trust anchor modification

data certificate issuer that provides the trust anchor modification data as a signed

data structure for the subordinate authorities (see col.7, lines 50-53 and col.8, lines

42-44 wherein all new certification are signed representing signed data structure).

As per claims 6, 12 and 20 Abadi et al (5,315,657 A) teach the system and method

of claims 1, 9 and 15 wherein the trust anchor modification data includes data

representing at least one of: scope of certification data, subordinate authority cross-

certification allowance data, subordinate authority certification rule data, subordinate

authority password rule data, subscriber trust anchor rule data and subscriber

password rule data, certificate expiry policy, subscriber algorithm policy, and policy

control message data (see as an example col.7, lines 66-68 and col.8, lines 1-2 for

cross-certification data; col.8, lines 45-52 for certificate expiry policy).

As per claims 7 and 13 Abadi et al (5,315,657 A) teach the system and method of

claims 1 and 12 wherein one of the trusted authorities is a root authority (see col.7,

lines 53-55).

> **As per claims 8, 14 and 21** Abadi et al (5,315,657 A) teach the system and method of claims 1, 13 and 15 including subordinate authority memory containing data representing validation starting authority data, wherein the data is stored in response to receiving the inter trusted authority trust modification (see col.8, lines 42-44; col.10, lines 7-24).

Allowable Subject Matter

10. Claim 11 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

11. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Kambiz Zand whose telephone number is (703)

306-4169. The examiner can normally reached on Monday-Thursday (8:00-5:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Gilberto Barron can be reached on (703) 305-1830. The fax phone

numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned

are as follows:

After-Final   (703) 746-7238

Official   (703) 746-7239

Non-Official/Draft   (703) 746-7240

Kambiz Zand

07/11/03

JUSTIN T. DARROW
PRIMARY EXAMINER